Base Realignment and Closure 2005

Ms. Maureen Sullivan
Federal Preservation Officer
Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Installations & Environment)

September 29, 2005

Key Imperatives: BRAC 2005

- **Further Transformation**
  - Rationalize infrastructure to force structure
  - Adjust footprint to maximize capability and efficiency
- **Maximize Joint Utilization**
  - Reduce overhead
  - Improve efficiency
  - Facilitate joint training and operations
- **Convert Waste to Warfighting**
  - Unnecessary capacity diverts DoD resources

Process Timeline

- ✓ SecDef initiates BRAC 05 Process (establish organization, process, and initial policy (Nov 02))
  - ✓ Selection Criteria Published (Feb 04)
    - ✓ SecDef BRAC Report and Certifications (Delivered March 23, 2004)
      - ✓ Commissioner Nominations (15 Mar 05)
        - ✓ Threat Assessment/Revised Force Structure Plan (15 Mar 05)
          - ✓ SecDef Approves and Forwards Recommendations for Realignments and Closures to Commission (May 1[illegible])
            - ✓ Commission Process (May 05 - Sep 05)
              - ✓ Presidential Review and Approval (Sep 05)
            - Congressional Action (Sep 05 + 45 Legislative Days)

NOV 02 ~DEC 05

Final Selection Criteria

Military Value

1. The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.

2. The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, **surge**, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.

Final Selection Criteria

Other Considerations

5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

7. The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions, and personnel.

8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste ma

Historic Properties were included in Criteria 8

Department Recommendations

- **222 Recommendations**
  - 842 Installations affected
    - 33 Major closures (>$100M Plant Replacement Value (PRV))
    - 29 Major realignments (400 or more net reduction in military/civilian personnel)
    - 780 Other actions
      - 274 Minor realignments (26% leased)
      - 506 Minor closures (12% leased)
- **$5.5B Annual Recurring Savings, $48.8B Net Present Value (NPV)**
  - With overseas: $6.7B Annual Recurring Savings, $64.2B NPV
- **Adjusts the U.S. base structure to receive 47,000 Army personnel returning from overseas**
- **Realize two dollars in savings for every dollar spent** comparing one-time costs to net present value savings

Results of Commission Review

- **Accepted about 65% of DoD's 222 recommendations (discounting minor changes the acceptance rate is 79%)**
- **Of the Department's proposed 33 major closures and 29 major realignments, the Commission approved 76 percent and 90 percent respectively**
- **Financial changes:**

($B)	DoD Submission	Commission Result	Changed
One-Time Costs	$24.4	$22.8	($1.6)
Annual Recurring Savings	$5.5	$4.4	($1.1)
20 Year Net Present Value	$48.8	$36.5	($12.3)

- **Report and recommendations forwarded to the President on September 8, 2005**
- **President approved report and recommendations and**

Major Closures: Installations Recommended for Closure with Plant Replacement Value Exceeding $100M (25 Total)

Army (12)

- Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA
- Fort Gillem, GA
- Fort McPherson, GA
- Newport Chemical Depot, IN
- Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS
- Selfridge Army Activity, MI
- Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS
- Fort Monmouth, NJ
- Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR
- Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX
- Deseret Chemical Depot, UT
- Fort Monroe, VA

Department of Navy (7)

- Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Concord Detachment, CA
- Broadway Complex, San Diego, CA*
- Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA
- Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME*
- Naval Station Pascagoula, MS
- Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA
- Naval Station Ingleside, TX

Air Force (6)

- Galena Forward Operating Location, AK*
- Kulis Air Guard Station, AK
- Onizuka Air Force Station, CA
- Cannon AFB, NM
- Brooks City Base, TX
- General Mitchell ARS, WI

* Added by the BRAC Commission

Major Realignments: Installations losing 400 + Net Total Military and Civilian Personnel (26 Total)

Army (5)

- Walter Reed National Military Medical Center (at Bethesda), DC
- Rock Island Arsenal , IL
- Ft Knox, KY
- Army Reserve Personnel Center, St Louis, MO
- Ft Eustis, VA

Department of Navy (11)

- MCLB Barstow, CA
- Naval Base Ventura City, CA
- Naval Base Coronado, CA
- Naval Medical Center San Diego, CA
- Naval District Washington, DC
- NAS Pensacola, FL
- NS Great Lakes, IL
- NSA Crane, IN
- NAS Corpus Christi, TX
- Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, VA
- NAS Oceana, VA*

Air Force (8)

- Eielson AFB, AK
- Elmendorf AFB, AK
- Mountain Home AFB, ID
- Pope AFB, NC
- Grand Forks AFB, ND
- Lackland AFB, TX
- Sheppard AFB, TX
- McChord AFB, WA

Defense Agencies / Multiple Services (2)

- NCR Leased locations, DC
- DFAS Arlington, VA

* Added by the BRAC Commission

Way Forward

- **The Commission submitted recommendations to the President on September 8th**
- **The President approved the Commission recommendations on September 15th**
- **Unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of disapproval before the earlier of 45 days* or adjournment *sine die*, the Department must close and realign the installations so recommended**
- **The Department must begin implementing the recommendations within 2 years and complete within 6 years**

If Congress adjourns for more than 3 days, the 45 day countdown is suspended.

Implementation and Reuse

Guiding Principles

- **Expeditious closure or realignment**
- **Fully utilize all appropriate means to transfer promptly**
  - "Mixed Tool Kit"
- **Rely upon – and leverage – market forces**
- **Collaboration and partnership**
- **Clarify procedures**
  - "Speak with One Voice"

Implementation – Local Redevelopment Authority

- **Communities may develop LRA to "speak with one voice"**
- **LRA will be responsible for**
  - Preparing the redevelopment plan
  - Directing the implementation of the plan
- **LRA should include:**
  - Political leaders
  - Potential public and private sector users
  - Providers of services for homeless (required by law)
  - Non-profit education and health institutions
  - Business leaders
  - Tribal representatives, when appropriate

Early Involvement with the LRA is Essenti

Implementation – Historic Properties

Message to the Military Services & Installations

- **Know what you have – up to date and accurate inventory**
- **Know who your external stakeholders are – who you are going to have to consult with**
- **Be part of the larger Installation BRAC implementation team – come to the table prepared**
- **Begin discussions with external stakeholders as soon as possible**

Cultural Resources at Proposed Major Closures

- **Two National Historic Landmarks**
  - Fort Monroe, VA
  - Medical Museum Collection at Walter Reed Medical Center, DC (Major Realignment)
- **Approximately 98 Individually Listed or Eligible Historic Properties**
  - 13 Archaeology Sites

Cultural Resources at Proposed Major Closures
Continued

- **8 Historic Districts**
  - Walter Reed Medical Center, DC (Major Realignment)
  - Fort Gillem, GA
  - Fort McPherson, GA
  - Selfridge Army Activity, MI
  - Fort Monmouth, NJ
  - Brooks City Base, TX
  - Fort Monroe, VA – 2 Districts
- **386 Historic Properties – Contributing Elements of a Historic Districts**
- **Native American Interests**

Fort Monroe, Virginia

- **Associated with founding of Virginia's Jamestown Colony**
- **Currently third oldest active military installation in the United States**
- **Largest stone fort (63 acres) in the United States**
- **Nation's only stone fort surrounded by a moat**
- **Contains Civil War Cemetery related to hospital and all burial sites may not be identified**
- **32 archeological sites**
  - Some sites date to pre-history
  - Archeological collection does not contain Native American human remains

Fort Monroe's National Historic Landmark

- **83 Housing Buildings**
- **2 Buildings to Support Housing**
- **55 Administrative Buildings**
- **3 Structures**
- **6 Landscape Features**
- **1 Stone Fort with 11 Named/Numbered Segments**

Fort Monroe – Reversion

- **295 of 570 acres of land revert back to the Commonwealth of Virginia**
  - If no longer used for fortification and national Defense
- **Requirement of reversionary interest**
- **Key Question – How are real property improvements treated it reverted to the Commonwealth?**

Fort Monroe National Historic Landmark

Fort Monroe and View of Officer's Housing

Source: http://www.tradoc.army.mil/surgeon/Images/AerialFtMonroe.gif and http://www.baydreaming.com/photopost/showphoto.php/photo/59/

Georgia
(National Register District)

- One Historic District with 40 Contributing Elements
  - 10 more awaiting determination
- 22 individually listed or eligible Historic Properties

Source: http://www.mcpherson.army.mil/housing/lodging.htm

Reserve Centers

Reserve Centers
range
from historic to new

BRAC Rulemaking Federal Register Notice

§174.19 Historic Preservation

- **The Secretary concerned may include such restrictions or conditions (typically a real property interest in the form of a restrictive covenant or preservation easement) in any deed or lease conveying an interest in historic property to a non-Federal entity.**
- **Before including such a covenant or easement in a deed or lease, the Secretary concerned shall consider whether:**
  - the jurisdiction that encompasses the property authorizes such a covenant or easement; and
  - the Secretary can give or assign to a third party the responsibility for monitoring and enforcing such a covenant or easement.

Published in the Federal Register on August 9, 2005
Comments due by October 11, 2005

Options To Protect Historic Properties

- **Historic Preservation Ordinances**
  - Advantages:
    - Based on police power; inexpensive
    - May be adjusted via administrative processes
  - Disadvantages:
    - Often spark regulatory undertakings litigation
    - May be adjusted via administrative processes
- **Work best when linked to comprehensive planning, zoning, & site plan review**

Options to Protect Historic Properties

- **Preservation Covenants**
  - Contracts, not actual property interests
  - May not “run with the land”
  - Enforceable only through legal remedies
- **Conservation Easements**
  - Recognized “negative servitude in gross”
  - Potentially perpetual, “run with the land”
  - Enforceable through equitable relief
- **The Covenant/Easement “Two Step”**

BRAC Historic Property Outreach

- **Concept – Provide overview of the National Historic Protection Act and other related legal requirements, provide tools/information, and make links (who to talk to about what).**
- **Developing a BRAC Cultural Resource Web Site – Will be linked to both BRAC web sites and Historic Preservation Web Sites, including:**
  - Office of Economic Adjustment
  - Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
  - National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers
  - National Park Service
- **Conference & Meeting Panels**

BRAC Web Sites

- **Department of Defense:**
  - http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/
  - http://www.denix.osd.mil
- **Office of Economic Adjustment:**
  - http://www.oea.gov/oeaweb.nsf/Home?OpenForm
- **BRAC Commission:**
  - http://www.brac.gov/
- **Department of the Army:**
  - http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/braco.htm
- **Department of the Navy:**
  - http://www.navybracpmo.org/
- **Department of the Air Force:**
  - http://www.af.mil/brac/